

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS BULLETIN

ISSUED WEEKLY

VOL. XXVII

APRIL 22, 1930

No. 34

[Entered as second-class matter December 11, 1912, at the post office at Urbana, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 31, 1918.]

BULLETIN No. 49

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

SUMMER WORK IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

By

CHARLES W. ODELL

Assistant Director, Bureau of Educational Research



PRICE 30 CENTS

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA
1930

The Bureau of Educational Research was established by act of the Board of Trustees June 1, 1918. It is the purpose of the Bureau to conduct original investigations in the field of education, to summarize and bring to the attention of school people the results of research elsewhere, and to be of service to the schools of the state in other ways.

The results of original investigations carried on by the Bureau of Educational Research are published in the form of bulletins. A list of available publications is given on the back cover of this bulletin. At the present time five or six original investigations are reported each year. The accounts of research conducted elsewhere and other communications to the school men of the state are published in the form of educational research circulars. From ten to fifteen of these are issued each year.

The Bureau is a department of the College of Education. Its immediate direction is vested in a Director, who is also an instructor in the College of Education. Under his supervision research is carried on by other members of the Bureau staff and also by graduates who are working on theses. From this point of view the Bureau of Educational Research is a research laboratory for the College of Education.

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
College of Education
University of Illinois, Urbana

BULLETIN No. 49

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

SUMMER WORK IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

By

CHARLES W. ODELL

Assistant Director, Bureau of Educational Research

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA

1930

PREFACE

Information concerning present practices is helpful to superintendents and boards of education in planning the work of a school system. The fact that certain things are being done in certain schools, or even in a large number of schools, does not, of course, mean that these practices should be introduced into all schools, but when a practice becomes at all general or when it is being introduced in an increasing number of schools, a superintendent should be informed concerning the matter. This bulletin on *summer work in public schools* is published for the purpose of bringing to the attention of superintendents and boards of education in Illinois, the present status of provisions for summer work in the schools of the state and the practices in schools elsewhere. The facts presented indicate an evident tendency to make some provision for school work during the summer months and it is believed desirable that superintendents and boards of education should be informed concerning what is being done in many places.

February 4, 1930

WALTER S. MONROE, *Director*



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	7
CHAPTER II. THE DEVELOPMENT AND PRESENT STATUS OF SUM- MER WORK IN THIS COUNTRY	9
CHAPTER III. SUMMER WORK IN ILLINOIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN 1929	21
CHAPTER IV. THE OUTCOMES OF SUMMER WORK	30
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	41

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
TABLE I. DATA CONCERNING SUMMER HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES	18
TABLE II. PER CENTS OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS OF DIFFERENT SIZES RESPONDING	23

SUMMER WORK IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Importance of the problem. Although summer work for public-school pupils has not received so much space in written and oral discussion of educational problems as has been accorded each of several others, it nevertheless should rank among those of relatively high importance in the educational field. This is evidenced, in part, by the fact that it has been receiving an increasing amount of attention for several decades. The rapid growth of attendance at summer sessions of colleges, normal schools, and universities, the ever increasing congestion in our cities, the movement for the reduction of child labor, the use of labor-saving machinery which renders the services of children less helpful on the farm, and the general social tendency for the family to assume less and the state more responsibility for children, have all contributed to bring the question of summer work in public schools into greater prominence. In view of these and other reasons, it seems worth while to make a brief study of the question, including its development and present status, and the available evidence as to the results that follow from the attendance of elementary and high-school pupils during the summer.

Plan and purpose of this bulletin. Summer work in public schools exists in many forms and varieties, ranging from individual tutoring of pupils who have failed, through summer sessions held in the school building and open to many if not all who desire to attend, up to summer quarters that constitute an integral part of all-year schools. It is the purpose of this bulletin to deal briefly with several phases of summer work, including all the various forms just referred to. Chapter II contains a brief history of the development of summer work in the elementary and secondary schools of the United States, including short descriptions of the plans of such work as given in a number of city-school systems, and summaries of several studies of the number and characteristics of summer sessions. Chapter III gives the results of a study of such work in the public schools of the State of Illinois for the summer of 1929. Chapter IV presents arguments for and against summer work, and the rather scanty evidence available as to

its outcomes. Finally in Chapter V the previous chapters are briefly summarized and conclusions stated.

In this bulletin, no effort will be made to trace and discuss in detailed fashion the various types of summer work offered. Moreover, in most cases elementary and high-school work will be treated together, since there appear to be few significant differences.

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT AND PRESENT STATUS OF SUMMER WORK IN THIS COUNTRY

Former lengths of school years. During the earlier part of the nineteenth century, and even later, it was not unusual for rural and small-town children, especially girls and small boys, to attend school during a considerable part of the summer rather than during the severe winter weather. Probably the chief cause was that because of the lack of good roads and the distances that must be travelled to reach the schools, it was difficult to attend school during the winter. However, as roads were improved and as cities and towns became more numerous, the practice of having summer terms became less common until it has become the almost universal practice for the longest vacation period of the year to come during the summer months, or perhaps to include all of them.

In the larger cities of the country conditions were different. Many, probably most, of them formerly had school years much longer than is the custom now, with short vacations including only a small part of the summer. For example, the Commissioner of Education¹ has reported data on lengths of school years about 1841-42. Some of the lengths are reported in days, some in weeks, and some in months. Boston is stated to have had a session of 224 days, Washington of 238, Philadelphia of 251½, and Detroit of 253. That of Cleveland was forty-three weeks in length, that of Chicago forty-eight, and that of New York forty-nine. Brooklyn, Baltimore, and Cincinnati had eleven-month sessions, whereas Buffalo had one of twelve months.

Decrease in length of sessions. The school years just cited are all much longer than those in more recent times. Fifty years later those in the same cities ranged from 180 days in Washington to 203 in Baltimore, and at present they are practically the same. In other words, the school years of these cities about ninety years ago were from twenty to sixty days, or one to three months, longer than at present. These long terms were not balanced by shorter school days. In the eight of the above named systems for which such figures are given, no daily session was less than five hours, and one was as much as seven hours, with recesses omitted, whereas in the same systems

¹"U. S. Commissioner of Education, Annual Report 1891-92." Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894, Vol. 2, p. 664.

fifty years later, and also at present, the sessions are mostly from four and one-half to five hours, an average of an hour or more less than in 1841-42.

In most cases the decreases in the lengths of the school years did not occur all at once, and seem not to have resulted from critical considerations of what was desirable, but rather to have been largely accidental and to have happened almost imperceptibly. For example, in Boston, which had a school year of 224 days about 1841, there were a number of short decreases resulting in a length of 200 in 1891. Since then the process has continued, the length being 197 in 1900, 187 in 1910, 182 in 1920, and approximately that at the present time.² The same change has occurred in most of the other cities, although a few exceptions exist. A study made a few years ago to which 569 cities responded showed that only one had a school year of over 200 days, and that approximately half of them had school years of not more than 180 days. Within the past few years there has been a slight tendency for city-school systems to increase the length of their terms. Thus fifty out of eight hundred cities reporting in 1928 claim to have added from five to twenty days to their terms within the last two years.³ Most of these, however, are small cities and not those which formerly had longer terms.

On the other hand, the length of school sessions in rural and small town schools has been increasing. Indeed, this increase has been so pronounced as to raise the average for the whole United States from 130 days in 1880 to 162 in 1920. Thus instead of the former condition in which city-school children received almost an entire year or at least eleven months of schooling and country-school children only about half that amount, or even less, it has now come to be that the former receive nine or ten months and the latter seven, eight, or nine.

The beginning of vacation schools. The first summer schools for elementary or high-school pupils, as distinct from the summer terms referred to above as existing earlier, were so-called "vacation schools." Their chief function, at least at first, was to keep the children who attended, pleasantly and perhaps profitably occupied so that they would be removed from undesirable influences to which they would otherwise be exposed. Some of what might be called the supplementary or non-essential school subjects were offered, usually in rather informal fashion, but no attempt was made to have the children do the

²"The Waning School Term of the Cities," *Los Angeles School Journal*, 7:15, November 5, 1923.

³Deffenbaugh, W. S. "Significant Movements in City School Systems," *U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin*, 1929, No. 16. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1929, p. 7-8.

work of the regular school year. Furthermore, these schools were established and maintained by charitable, social, or other organizations and were not an integral part of the public schools. The first such vacation school on record appears to have been organized by First Church in Boston in 1866.⁴ The second was established in Providence four or five years later by a voluntary committee. Both of these schools appear to have remained open during all but three weeks of the summer vacation. In 1894 the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor started such schools in New York City. In 1896 they were begun in Chicago under the auspices of the Civic Federation, which was replaced in 1898 by the Chicago Woman's Club. In Pittsburgh the Civic Club, in Cleveland the Ladies' Aid Society of the Old Stone Church, in Rochester the Woman's Educational and Industrial Union and the Playground League, and in other cities similar organizations established them.

The first real summer schools. In some of the cities referred to above, permission was granted the organizations maintaining vacation schools to make use of school buildings. From this step others followed until the summer work was incorporated as part of the regular public-school system. Thus in Providence, for example, the schools, after being discontinued in 1876 and resumed again in 1894, were taken over by the Board of Education in 1900; in New York they were taken over somewhat earlier, 1897, and in Chicago, about the same time as in Providence. In many cases the Board of Education at first contributed only a portion of the expense and did not assume entire control, in others the whole step was taken at once. By about 1900 the movement for the incorporation of vacation schools into regular school systems may be said to have been fairly well under way, although it had actually been carried out in a comparatively few systems. The same may be said of the tendency to offer more or less the same work as in the regular year. Instead of devoting practically all of their time to activities largely recreational in nature, pupils began to study one or two of the regular school subjects and then gradually more and more until the work became quite similar to that of the regular year, although perhaps not including all subjects.

The first all-year school. Although Buffalo and several other cities had what may properly be called all-year schools about 1840, no systems deserving this term appear to have existed near the close of

⁴Perry, C. A. "Vacation Schools," *Wider Use of the School Plant*. New York City: Russell Sage Foundation, 1910, Chapter V.
Reals, W. H. "A Study of the Summer High School," *Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education*, No. 337. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928. 88 p.

the nineteenth century. Bluffton,⁵ Indiana, seems to have been the first to organize its schools on such a basis, since those having it earlier had discontinued the practice. In 1904 it adopted four three-months terms with the provision that pupils were to attend only three of the four terms. This was qualified by allowing those who had been absent a great deal to attend enough of the fourth term to make up their absences.

Features of summer work in different cities. *Newark.*⁶ The city whose summer work has attracted the most attention of any in the country is undoubtedly Newark, New Jersey. In 1885 it established what is claimed to have been the first real summer school, as distinguished from vacation schools, in the United States. As elsewhere, the work in Newark began on a small scale and gradually increased. During the first few years the summer work was merely a separate term or session offered in some of the schools. In 1912, however, the all-year school with four twelve-weeks' terms was introduced. There were four weeks of vacation during the year, one at Christmas, one at Easter, and two toward the end of August. The work offered in the summer in the all-year schools was the same as that during the other three quarters. Regular teachers were employed. Entrance at the beginning and graduation at the end of each quarter were allowed, and in numerous other ways the four quarters were made as similar as possible. Apparently it was required that pupils attend the fall, winter, and spring quarters, and not the summer one, attendance at the latter being optional. The plan was not completely adopted. Some schools were put on the all-year plan, others offered special summer work, and apparently others were closed during the summer. All pupils who wished to attend in the summer were allowed to do so.

*North Dakota State Normal School.*⁷ The summer work for elementary-school pupils at the State Normal School at Minot, North Dakota, began about 1914. The session was six weeks in length and was intended chiefly for laggards. As time went on, however, the proportion of laggards gradually decreased and that of pupils taking advanced work increased. After several years on this plan, the work for the whole year was organized into four quarters, the summer quarter, however, being different from the other three in that drawing, manual training, physical education, and music were omitted,

⁵Wirt, W. A. "A School Year of Twelve Months," *Education*, 27:619-22, June, 1907.

⁶Carson, D. B. "The All-Year School," *Journal of Education*, 88:563-68, December 5, 1918.

Farrand, Wilson and O'Shea, M. V. "The All-Year Schools of Newark, New Jersey." Newark, New Jersey: Board of Education, 1925. 96 p.

Lovell, L. E. "All-Year School," *Educational Review*, 73:196-202, April, 1927.

⁷Clarke, W. F. "An All-Year Elementary School," *Elementary School Journal*, 22:286-89, December, 1921.

and the daily sessions lasted only from 8:30 until 12:00. Apparently summer attendance was entirely optional, but about 70 per cent of the number of students in the regular sessions attended.

*Amarillo.*⁸ Amarillo, Texas, made a somewhat unusual organization of the school year with three sixteen-weeks' terms instead of the more usual four twelve-weeks' quarters of an all-year school. All pupils were allowed, and apparently also required, to attend two of the three terms free, and the regular year's work was covered in the thirty-two weeks. Apparently all pupils who were willing to pay the tuition charges attended the third term also. At the time that this plan was inaugurated, it was stated that it was only temporary and that the school authorities hoped to change it to one wherein two of the terms would be devoted to academic work and the third to practical application thereof, with all pupils attending all three terms.

*Omaha.*⁹ The Commercial High School of Omaha began the all-year plan with four twelve-weeks' terms about 1918. Pupils were allowed to enter at the beginning and were graduated at the end of each quarter. Other high schools in the city had for some time given eight-weeks' summer terms, but the all-year plan was so successful that they were contemplating changing to it.

*Nashville.*¹⁰ Next to Newark, Nashville, Tennessee, has probably received the most publicity for its summer work. After a thorough study of the question, the organization of the schools was changed from two ordinary semesters to four twelve-weeks' terms with two weeks' vacation at Christmas, and two in the summer. As at Newark, the attempt was made to make the work and conditions surrounding it during the summer just the same as during the other quarters. At Nashville also attendance during the summer was made voluntary; nevertheless about two-thirds of the pupils enrolled. All teachers who wished to do so were allowed to teach, the result being that 86 per cent of them did. Both teachers and pupils in the summer quarter were allowed, if they wished, to take a vacation during any one of the other three quarters, but apparently they were encouraged to remain for all four.

*Seattle.*¹¹ Seattle has offered summer work for a number of years. That for elementary pupils is only six weeks in length, whereas that

⁸"All-Year Schools," *Elementary School Journal*, 21:10-12, September, 1920.

⁹Beveridge, J. H. "Omaha High Schools on All-Year Plan," *School Life*, 11:22, October, 1925.

¹⁰Weber, H. C. "All-Year Public School Succeeding," *Texas Outlook*, 9:7-8, June, 1925.

Weber, H. C. "To Increase the Educated Quota—The All-Year School," *Journal of Education*, 102:102-7, August 13, 1925.

¹¹"All-Year Schools," *Elementary School Journal*, 21:10-12, September, 1920.

for high-school pupils is eight weeks. Apparently there are separate classes, in some cases at least, for pupils who have failed or have been in danger of failing and for those who are attending in order to gain time or credit.

*Aliquippa.*¹² Aliquippa, Pennsylvania, rather recently adopted the all-year plan, but apparently with a different motive from that of many other systems. In this case, as in that of Bluffton, the motive seems to be chiefly financial economy. It is not expected that children will attend all four quarters, but that three-fourths of them will be in school each quarter, or, in other words, each child will attend three of the four quarters. Thus because greater use is made of the school plant and the additional amount necessary to pay teachers is not so great as the additional amount of schooling gained by pupils, economy is effected.

*New York State.*¹³ In most cases the city systems that have offered summer work have met the expenditures necessary out of their ordinary school funds, in some cases charging tuition from the pupils to supplement these, or occasionally even to meet the whole expense. Furthermore, there has been little action by state legislatures or other controlling bodies regarding the matter. In New York State, however, definite action has been taken with regard to summer schools, so that they may be said to have state encouragement. Some four years ago a special appropriation of twenty-five thousand dollars was made to provide for supervising and inspecting summer and evening high schools and for holding the Regents Examinations of pupils therein. More or less as a result of this encouragement, the number of such schools in the State of New York has increased rather rapidly. In 1925, the first year after the provision was made, there were twenty-two schools with over nineteen thousand pupils. The very next year the number increased to thirty-five schools with almost twenty-seven thousand pupils, or about a 40 per cent gain. In practically all cases the terms were seven or eight weeks and the daily periods were sixty minutes, although some periods ranged from eighty up to one hundred and twenty minutes. Two-thirds of the pupils attending were making up work, and about one-third were studying advanced subjects. About one-third of the schools charged tuition.

¹²Deffenbaugh, W. S. "Significant Movements in City School Systems," *U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin*, 1929, No. 16. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1929, p. 7-8.

¹³"Twenty-second Annual Report of the New York State Education Department." Albany: University of the State of New York, 1926, p. 246-50.

"Twenty-third Annual Report of the New York State Education Department." Albany: University of the State of New York, 1927, Vol. 1, p. 49-50, 188-92.

Studies of summer work. *Deffenbaugh (1917).*¹⁴ In 1917 Deffenbaugh published the results of a study carried on for the United States Bureau of Education. According to this study 109 city systems reported summer high-school work, and 211 summer elementary work. Seventy-five of those having high-school work, and sixty-eight of those having elementary work, admitted any pupil who desired to enter, and in addition ninety-five of the latter admitted any who desired to enter grades in which work was given, but did not offer it in all eight grades. The length of the term varied from four to twelve weeks, about half being six weeks, with eight next most common. The length of the daily session was usually three or four hours, or somewhere between.

*Bush (1924).*¹⁵ In the year indicated, Bush published the results of a letter and questionnaire study of high-school summer work, mostly in cities of from twenty-five thousand to one hundred thousand population. Out of 273 schools addressed 190 responded, and of these 83 offered summer work. The terms ranged from four to ten weeks in length, with six and eight weeks, as before, being most common. Practically all had five days a week with pupils attending each class each day. About half of the periods were sixty minutes in length, the others ranging from forty up to one hundred and twenty. About three-fourths had daily sessions lasting three to four hours. In about four-fifths, pupils were restricted to two subjects. Only 18 per cent offered any subject desired. Among those commonly not offered were home economics, manual training, physics, chemistry, stenography, and typing. In all cases regular teachers were used, and in slightly over one-fourth some others also. One-fourth of the systems had been giving summer work for no more than two years, and less than half for more than five years. Bush gives other data not reported here as to teachers' salaries and loads, number of cuts permitted, types of high schools, and so forth.

*Jones (1925).*¹⁶ This study was limited to Indiana high schools of more than 150 enrollment. Jones reports that twenty-two such schools had offered summer work at some time in the past, and that nineteen of the twenty-two did so in the summer of 1925. All of them were among the larger schools, the smallest having an enrollment

¹⁴Deffenbaugh, W. S. "Summer Sessions of City Schools," *U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin*, 1917, No. 45. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1917. 45 p.

¹⁵Bush, R. H. "Current Practices in Summer School," *School Review*, 32:142-46, February, 1924.

¹⁶Jones, J. W. "High School Summer Work in Indiana," *Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University*, Vol. 2, No. 2. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1925, p. 43-47.

of slightly more than three hundred. Less than one-fourth of the pupils enrolled did so to make up previous failures. Two-thirds of the schools charged tuition, which ranged from six to twelve dollars, ten being much the most common amount. Only regular teachers were employed. In almost all cases pupils were limited to two subjects. The subjects given, in order of frequency, were history, algebra, geometry, and English. Jones also gathered enrollment figures for five years, showing a steady increase from 927 pupils in 1921 to 3,290 in 1925. In other words, about one-eighth of the pupils regularly enrolled in the schools offering summer work attended them.

*Hoffman (1925).*¹⁷ Hoffman made a study of cities having a population of over one hundred thousand and received returns from all but two. Exactly two-thirds of these offered summer work in 1923, most of those that did not being the smaller ones. The summer enrollment ranged from about one-thirtieth up to one-third of that of the regular year, the median being near 13 per cent. Approximately one-third reported six weeks, and another third eight weeks, of work, with none more than ten. The most usual length of daily sessions was four hours, the others ranging from three to six. Sixty- and ninety-minute periods were most common, with forty and fifty fairly frequent, and others running up to one hundred and twenty. In most cities the work was given in one building only, Chicago with six reporting the largest number. Pupils were ordinarily limited to two subjects. Only about 20 per cent of the cities had special classes for repeaters or those wishing to gain time. The salaries paid the teachers averaged about five or six dollars a day, and those paid principals nine or ten. Although teachers of the regular year were commonly used, about half of the systems made use of some others.

*Bush (1926).*¹⁸ In addition to the study referred to above, Bush made another. This dealt with the secondary schools of Illinois, exclusive of the city of Chicago, in the summer of 1926. He found that seventeen systems planned to offer summer work, and made an intensive study of these. (His report is quite detailed and only a few of the findings will be given here.) The seventeen systems were all of such size as to have regular year enrollments of five hundred or more, and constituted about 35 per cent of all schools of that size in the state. Their summer enrollments ranged from 4 to 44 per cent of their regular year enrollments, the total being about 19 per cent.

¹⁷Hoffman, M. D. "Status of Summer High Schools in Cities of More than 100,000 Population," *School Review*, 33:107-14, February, 1925.

¹⁸Bush, R. H. *The Status of the Summer Schools in the Secondary Schools in Illinois*. Springfield, Illinois: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1927. 69 p.

During a five-year period, the summer enrollment in these schools had increased from 2,601 to 3,785. No teachers other than those on the regular staffs were employed. The most common method of determining the subjects offered was to give those for which advance enrollments indicated there would be sufficient demand. Eight of the seventeen sessions were six weeks in length, and eight, eight weeks. All but three met five days a week, these meeting six. The length of the school day was most commonly four hours, and in no case less than that nor more than five. All but two of the schools limited pupils to two subjects. The fraction of all pupils enrolled who had previously failed was not far from one-half. Ten of the summer schools had supervision whereas seven did not. The number of years during which such schools have been in operation ranged from one to twenty-five, over half of them being between three and ten, inclusive. Seven of the seventeen schools were supported by tuition and one partly so. In the others tuition charges varied from five to thirty dollars per term or per subject.

*Biennial Surveys of Education (1924-27).*¹⁹ The last few Biennial Surveys of Education of the Bureau of Education have contained data on summer work in public schools. These report the figures given in Table I. It will be seen that these figures show a steady increase. During the four years from the first to the last, the increase in the number of cities offering such work was almost 60 per cent, that in the number of pupils about 90 per cent, and in the number of teachers almost 80 per cent. For both elementary and high schools the last survey referred to reported sixty-six cities of one hundred thousand or more with four hundred thousand pupils and nine thousand teachers, almost one hundred and fifty cities of from thirty to one hundred thousand with about sixty thousand pupils and two thousand teachers, and about three hundred cities of from ten to thirty thousand with twenty-seven thousand pupils and over a thousand teachers. The total is over five hundred cities, almost five hundred thousand pupils and twelve thousand teachers. This shows the enormous growth of the summer school movement since it began about a generation or more ago.

¹⁹Phillips, F. M. (Prepared by). "Statistics of City School Systems, 1921-22," *U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin*, 1924, No. 34. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1925, p. 110-115.

Phillips, F. M. (Prepared by). "Statistics of City School Systems, 1923-24," *U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin*, 1925, No. 41. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1926, p. 60-68.

Phillips, F. M. (Prepared by). "Statistics of City School Systems, 1925-26," *U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin*, 1927, No. 32. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1928, p. 64-72.

TABLE I. DATA CONCERNING SUMMER HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

Size of City	1920-22			1922-24			1924-26		
	Cities	Pupils	Teachers	Cities	Pupils	Teachers	Cities	Pupils	Teachers
Over 100,000.....	29	46,043	1,441	40	74,298	2,110	41	90,748	2,698
30,000 to 100,000.....	39	9,123	379	38	9,734	357	48	13,119	2,463
10,000 to 30,000.....	34	3,177	150	57	5,796	239	72	7,506	327
Total.....	102	58,343	1,970	135	89,828	2,706	161	111,373	3,488

Summary. A century or somewhat less ago, the sessions of most city schools were considerably longer than at present, frequently continuing throughout most of the summer. It was also common for rural and small-town schools to have summer terms. Summer work as given now has little if any connection with the facts just mentioned, but instead seems to have developed from vacation schools, the first of which was organized in Boston in 1866. At first these were not supported by public taxation and did not offer work in most of the regular school subjects, but, beginning with Newark in 1885, they began to come under the control of boards of education and to give more or less the same work as in the regular year. In 1904 Bluffton, Indiana, organized an all-year school. A few other cities have followed Bluffton in this, until a decided majority of the larger cities of this country and many of the smaller ones are now offering summer work of some type or other. The results of a number of studies indicate that such work is increasing rapidly. The last figures reported, now about four years old, show that more than five hundred cities offering summer work had an enrollment therein of about half a million pupils •taught by about twelve thousand teachers. Allowing for the increase since that time and for the work offered in smaller systems than those included in the study, it is probable that present figures are at least 50 per cent greater than those just given. The various studies also indicate that the typical summer term is six or eight weeks in length, with daily sessions of not far from four hours, and usually sixty-minute class periods. High-school pupils are generally limited to two subjects and elementary pupils correspondingly restricted. Usually both pupils who have failed and those who wish to do advanced work are admitted, and the classes are ordinarily taught by regular-year teachers.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

- AMERICAN, SADIE. "Movement for Vacation Schools," *American Journal of Sociology*, 4:309-25, November, 1898.
- AMERICAN, SADIE. "Vacation Schools," *Education*, 26:509-18, May, 1906.
- BLACKWELDER, I. S. "Extracts from the Last Report of the Superintendent of the Chicago Vacation Schools," *Elementary School Teacher*, 5:432-38, March, 1905.
- DEFFENBAUGH, W. S. "Recent Movements in City School Systems," *U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin*, 1927, No. 8. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1927, p. 18-22.
- DUGGAN, S. J. "The All-Year School," *Journal of Education*, 106:214-15, September 12, 1927.
- ELSON, W. H. "The All-Year School Plan in Cleveland," *Journal of Education*, 73:11-12, January 5, 1911.

- FARRAND, WILSON and O'SHEA, M. V. "All-Year Schools in Newark," *School and Society*, 23:462-69, April 10, 1926.
- HEBB, B. Y. "All-Year Schools Have Many Advantages," *School Life*, 8:198, May, 1923.
- KENNEDY, J. W. "The All-Year School," *Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association*. Washington: National Education Association, 1917, p. 795-801.
- MONROE, PAUL. "Vacation Schools and Continuous Sessions of Public School," *Cyclopedia of Education*, Vol. 5. New York: Macmillan Company, 1913, p. 701-2.
- REALS, W. H. "A Study of the Summer High School, with a Detailed Analysis of the Achievement in Two Summer High Schools," *Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education*, No. 337. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928. 88 p.
- WEBB, F. S. "Bibliography of All-Year Schools and Vacation Schools in the United States," *U. S. Bureau of Education Library Leaflet*, No. 23. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1923. 15 p.
- WEBER, H. C. "Defense through the Educated Quota: The All-Year School," *Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association*. Washington: National Education Association, 1925, p. 751-59.
- WIENER, WILLIAM. "An Educational Innovation—The All-Year High School," *American School Board Journal*, 61:29-30, December, 1920.
- "Summer High School Enrolment," *Pennsylvania School Journal*, 78:176, November, 1929.
- "The Waning School Term of the Cities," *School Life*, 9:34, October, 1923. *
- "U. S. Commissioner of Education, Annual Report, 1911." Washington: Government Printing Office, 1912, Vol. 1, p. 151-54.

CHAPTER III

SUMMER WORK IN ILLINOIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN 1929

The data obtained. The purpose of this study was to ascertain certain facts concerning the summer work done by pupils and the practices connected therewith in the public elementary and high schools of the State of Illinois in 1929. The first step was to send a double post-card to the principal or superintendent in charge of each such school.¹ The chief question on this card had to do with whether or not summer work of any sort was offered in 1929. To those who responded that such work had been offered a questionnaire consisting of thirteen questions, most of which had two or more parts each, was sent. This questionnaire will not be reproduced here, but in the succeeding discussion the questions will be given one at a time and the answers presented.

Cards were sent to the officials in charge of 1,479 elementary and 946 high schools. They were returned from 503 elementary and 557 high schools, or, in other words, from about 34 per cent of the former and 59 per cent of the latter. Eighty-five, or 17 per cent of the elementary schools that responded, were reported as having offered summer work, and 410, or 81 per cent, as not offering it, whereas 12, or 2 per cent, did not answer the question. Of the high schools that responded, 94, or 17 per cent, offered summer work in 1929, 451, or 81 per cent, did not offer it, and 13, or 2 per cent, did not answer the question. From these figures it is apparent that the per cent of elementary and high schools answering that had and had not offered summer work in the given summer were the same. It is not probable that the per cents of all elementary and high schools in the state doing so were the same, however, since there are at least two reasons which indicate that the per cent of high schools offering summer work was considerably greater than that of elementary schools. In the first place it is generally true in any such study as this that a larger proportion of responses is received from systems that have the feature under discussion than from those that do not have it. Therefore, although the per cent of all elementary schools replying was much smaller than that of all high schools, it is probable that most elementary and high schools that offered such work replied; and, therefore, it is probable that the per cent of elementary schools in the state giving summer work was actually smaller than that of the high schools. In all probability the

¹Because of an error in mailing out these cards, a few principals and superintendents did not receive any. The number omitted, however, was small, constituting less than 2 per cent of all in the state.

per cent of elementary schools that offered summer work in 1929 was between 6 and 17 per cent, probably nearer the former, and that of high schools between 10 and 17 per cent, also probably nearer the former. The second reason referred to above is that the proportion of responses was in general greater in the larger school systems than in the smaller ones,² and further that both the responses obtained and other data indicate that the per cents of the larger school systems giving summer work were greater than those of the smaller systems. Therefore since most of the systems not replying tended to be small, it is likely that they were among those not offering summer work.

Of the 81 elementary and 93 high schools that responded affirmatively on the postcards, only 43 elementary and 52 high schools returned questionnaires filled out so that the results were usable. In a number of these cases, however, all the questions were not definitely answered, so that the data given in connection with separate questions are in most cases based on somewhat fewer than this number of responses.

The per cents of schools of various sizes returning postals and answering the chief question thereon affirmatively are shown by Table II. From the figures therein one can see that although all of the elementary-school systems having more than five thousand pupils returned the cards, the fractions gradually decrease to only 21 per cent, or about one in five, of those having less than one hundred pupils. The same, although to a less marked degree, is true of high schools, as 88 per cent of the high schools with more than a thousand pupils returned the cards, whereas the number decreases, with one irregularity, to only 48 per cent of those of less than one hundred pupils. Similarly, but even more markedly, the per cents of all those responding who gave affirmative answers decreased with the size of the schools. Seventy-three per cent of the largest elementary-school systems reported summer work, but only 9 per cent of the smallest. Likewise 67 per cent of the largest group of high schools and only 7 per cent of the smallest reported it. In both cases the per cent of the largest schools is eight or nine times as great as that of the smallest schools offering summer work.

Question 1. What was the total enrollment in each grade for the regular year 1928-29 and for the summer of 1929? Only thirty-one of the elementary and thirty-five of the high schools gave such responses to this question that their figures could be used. The total 1928-1929 enrollment for these schools was 417,336 in the elementary

²Table II and the discussion thereof bring out this fact.

TABLE II. PER CENTS OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS OF DIFFERENT SIZES RESPONDING

	Elementary Schools							High Schools				
	1-99	100-299	300-499	500-999	1000-2999	3000-4999	5000 or more	1-99	100-299	300-499	500-999	1000 or more
Enrollment 1928-1929												
Per cent of cards returned.....	21	37	44	50	71	92	100	48	70	65	84	88
Per cent of responses affirmative....	9	10	27	23	46	33	73	7	20	33	48	67

grades, and 121,769 in the high school. The total summer enrollments reported were, respectively, 20,079 and 21,655, or about 5 and 18 per cent of the regular year enrollments. Since Chicago was one of the cities that contributed data and its size is so much greater than that of all the other contributing systems combined, it seems well also to give figures with Chicago omitted. These were 56,648 elementary and 35,542 high-school pupils in the regular year and 2,784 elementary and 4,098 high-school pupils in summer. Thus the per cents in the other systems than Chicago were about five and twelve. The proportions of the summer enrollments to the regular-year enrollments in the separate school systems ranged from less than 1 up to 70 per cent in elementary schools, and to 35 per cent in high schools. The median per cent was four for elementary schools and five for high schools. Twenty per cent of the elementary schools and 30 per cent of the high schools had summer enrollments that were 10 per cent or more of their 1928-1929 enrollments.

Question 2. How many weeks in length was your regular school year in 1928-29? Your summer work in 1929? The reported lengths of summer sessions varied from three to twelve weeks, but almost half of the total number were six weeks and more than one-fourth eight weeks.³ For the regular year 30 per cent of the schools had thirty-eight weeks, 27 per cent thirty-six, and 22 per cent forty weeks. The others ranged from thirty to forty-two. The combined lengths of sessions for the regular year plus the summer work ranged from thirty-six to forty-eight weeks, the most common being forty-six, which was that of almost one-third of the systems. Next to this was forty-four in almost one-fifth. The coefficient of correlation between the length of the summer session and that of the regular school year was $-.16 \pm .08$, which indicates that there is very little if any connection between the two.

Question 3. Did pupils attend as many hours per day in the summer as in the regular year? If not, how many hours? The variety of practice with regard to the number of hours per day attended by pupils was even greater than that as to the number of weeks. Almost 20 per cent of the schools had summer sessions of the same length as the regular year sessions; more than 30 per cent had them four hours in length; about 20 per cent had three hours, and 16 per cent two hours. The others ranged from one-half up to five and one-half hours. The median for all was four. Although the question as to when the daily

³The replies to this and most of the other questions were not differentiated according to whether they came from elementary or high schools because no significant differences appeared. In the few cases in which such differences did appear they will be noted.

sessions began and ended was not asked, many replies gave that information. In practically every case in which the hours per day were not greater than three and one-half and also in most of those in which they were four, there was a single morning session, most often beginning at 8:30, but sometimes at 8:00, 9:00, or some other time.

Question 4. Was credit given in connection with summer work? If so, how much? If not, what was purpose of summer work? The responses to this question indicate that 86 per cent of the schools gave credit for summer work, whereas the remaining 14 per cent did not. Thirty per cent of those that gave credit responded that they gave "regular" or "full" credit, whatever that may mean. Twenty-five per cent reported one semester's credit and about 10 per cent one-half semester's credit. Almost 30 per cent of those who reported that credit was allowed did not answer the second part of the question at all, or in such a way as to give information that could be used. Of the few schools that did not allow credit for summer work, over one-third gave as the purpose of such work the preparation of pupils for special examinations, which, if passed, apparently would give credit. Another third stated merely "to strengthen pupils," apparently meaning to help pupils who were in danger of failing and might be prevented from doing so by extra work.

Question 5. Were all regular subjects taught? If not, which were? Less than 20 per cent of the schools taught all regular subjects, but an additional 30 per cent taught either all that anyone wished to take, or all that any pupils who wished to attend had failed in. In other words, for all practical purposes almost half of the schools may be considered as giving complete offerings. About two-thirds of the remaining elementary schools offered a group including all the so-called "major" subjects. These differed somewhat in various schools, but in practically all included arithmetic, reading and language, with history, geography, and spelling frequently added. The other elementary schools appear to have offered work in a single subject, or perhaps two subjects, each, those named most often being arithmetic, language, and agriculture. In the high schools that did not offer all subjects, or at least all those requested, history, usually American, was most commonly given, being offered by about two-thirds of such schools. English was next, being given in about half, and geometry and Latin almost as frequent. Either geometry or algebra or both were given in about two-thirds of the schools. Almost all other common high-school subjects were named by some schools; manual training and mechanical drawing, however, being named by only one each, and domestic science not at all.

Question 6. Who attended? All who wished? Those who had failed? Those who wished to gain time? Those who were ill or out for other reasons? If others, who? Not quite half of the schools allowed all pupils who wished to do so to attend. Almost 94 per cent admitted pupils who had failed, about 56 per cent accepted those who wished to gain time, and about 70 per cent those who were ill or out for other reasons. Evidently, according to these figures, the one dominant purpose of offering summer work was to enable pupils who had either failed or lost time to make up their work. Indeed, comments and additional information given on the returned questionnaires indicated that in a number of the schools which allowed all pupils who wished to take work in the summer or which provided opportunities for pupils to gain time, the emphasis was put on taking care of those who needed to make up work.

Question 7. Who taught in the summer? Regular teachers? Others? How were teachers selected? In 90 per cent of the schools responding only regular teachers were employed, in 6 per cent both regular and other teachers, and in 4 per cent others only. In about half of the systems it was indicated that principals or superintendents selected the teachers, no other basis being given. In a few cases it was indicated that they attempted to select the most able teachers or those whom they considered best qualified. About one-seventh of the systems appear to have allowed all of the regular-year teachers who wished to do so to teach. In a few cases teachers were selected according to the order in which they applied for the opportunity, the desires of the parents or pupils, and on other bases.

Question 8. Was summer work supervised similarly to work during regular year? If not, was it supervised at all? Fifty-four per cent of the principals and superintendents reported that the summer work received supervision similar to that given in the regular year, and half of the remainder that it received some supervision. Thus in almost one-fourth of the systems the summer work seems to have received no supervision whatsoever.

Question 9. Was summer work organized in classes as in regular year? Was it rather of a tutorial or individual nature? About three-fifths of the systems reported that the summer work was organized in classes as in the regular year, whereas about two-fifths stated that it was not so organized. Almost half of those that reported regular class work during the summer also answered the second part of the question affirmatively so that about 70 per cent of the schools reported work of a tutorial or individual nature. Apparently the situa-

tion is that in about one-third of the schools the summer work was entirely in regular classes, in about 40 per cent it was entirely tutorial or individual, and in slightly less than one-third there was either some of both, or, although the work was organized in regular classes, the enrollment was so small that it was largely individual. In almost all cases in which work was reported as totally unsupervised, it was of a tutorial nature, whereas practically all of the regular class work and a portion of the tutorial work was supervised.

Question 10. Was summer work carried on in school buildings? If not, where? The answers to this question were rather closely connected with those to No. 9. In practically every case in which class work was reported and in some others it was carried on in the school buildings, about 75 per cent of the work being done there. Of the slightly more than 25 per cent reporting it carried on elsewhere, three-fourths stated that it was done in teachers' homes. It was almost always true that when the work was done outside of the school building, it was not supervised at all.

Question 11. Were fees charged of summer pupils? If so, how much? Was the amount sufficient to cover all expenditures? Or only to pay teachers? Or less than enough to pay teachers? Seventy per cent of the systems charged fees of summer pupils, whereas 30 per cent did not. Of those that did, less than 30 per cent charged enough to cover all expenditures, about 60 per cent just enough to pay teachers, and about 10 per cent not enough for that purpose. The bases of determining fees were so varied that it is rather difficult to summarize the data on this point. The most common basis in high school was the semester credit. Tuition ranged from five to thirty dollars per credit, the median being fifteen. In elementary school the most common practice was a flat fee for the whole period, usually six weeks. The amount of this ranged from five to forty dollars, ten being the median. In a number of cases charges were made on the hour basis, the range being from thirty-five cents to one dollar per hour. A few schools charged by the week, from seventy-five cents to two dollars, one dollar being most common. In several cases charges were based on the number of subjects carried, the number of classes attended per week, and so on.

Question 12. Is summer work offered regularly every summer? In what year did it begin? Seventy per cent of the systems reported summer work offered regularly every summer. The length of time that it has been offered ranges from one to twenty years. Only about one-eighth of the schools have offered it more than ten years, how-

ever, and only about two-fifths for more than five. The median length of time is four. Apparently, therefore, the practice of giving summer work is relatively new in most of the systems that do so, and even though it is reported as a regular practice, it has in many cases not existed long enough that this can appropriately be said of it. Its continuation probably frequently depends upon the attitude of the superintendent or principal in charge.

Question 13. Do you favor summer work? Do you intend to continue it? Do you favor making it free? If not, should enough be charged to cover all expenditures? As would be expected, a large majority of the officials in charge of systems that offered summer work favored the practice. Only about 12 per cent responded that they did not. Likewise all but about 13 per cent stated that they intended to continue the practice. Almost 60 per cent, including practically all of those in charge of systems where it is now free and a number in charge of systems where it is not, replied that when offered it should be free. Seventy per cent of those who believed that it should not be free, or about 30 per cent of the total number responding, thought that enough should be charged to cover all expenditures.

Summary. Responses from about one-third of the officials in charge of elementary and three-fifths of those in charge of high schools in Illinois were received to a questionnaire dealing with summer work. Almost exactly one-sixth of those reporting stated that such work was given in the summer of 1929. For all schools in the state the proportion was undoubtedly somewhat lower. The responses show that the practice of giving summer work is much more common in large systems than in small, the per cent of the largest offered being about seventy and of the smallest less than ten. The situation in general may be described as follows: About 5 per cent as many pupils were enrolled as in the regular year. The term was usually six weeks, although not infrequently eight. The daily session was commonly four hours or more in length. Pupils were ordinarily allowed to earn a semester's credit in one or two high-school subjects or in all elementary subjects. All subjects desired were offered by about half the schools and most of the so-called "fundamental" subjects by the others. Not quite half of the schools allowed all pupils who wished to do so to attend, most of the remainder limiting attendance to those who had failed or perhaps had missed school through illness or other good reasons. In almost all cases only regular teachers were used, and in a majority the work was supervised. In about two-fifths of the systems it was of a tutorial nature, in half of the remainder there were regular

classes only, and in the other half some of both. About three-fourths of the work was done in school buildings. Less than one-third of the systems charged no tuition. Of those that did a majority charged just enough to pay the teachers, the median amount being fifteen dollars per semester credit for high-school work and ten for the whole term of elementary work. Most of the systems offer work regularly every year, but only half of them have done so for more than four years. A large majority of the officials in charge favor summer work and intend to continue the practice. Sixty per cent of them believe that it should be free.

CHAPTER IV

THE OUTCOMES OF SUMMER WORK

Introduction. Although a great deal more of what has been written and said concerning summer work in public elementary and high schools has been favorable than unfavorable, there have also been a number of opposing arguments advanced. It is the purpose of this chapter to consider first the arguments advanced on both sides of the question and then the rather limited available evidence as to the truth of some of these arguments, or, in other words, as to the beneficial and harmful outcomes of summer work.

Favorable arguments.¹ One of the most common arguments advanced in favor of summer work is that of financial economy. Because the school plant is used for two or three months when it would otherwise be idle, because school is in session at a time of the year when heat and artificial light are rarely required, and because, at least in many cases, the additional amount paid teachers is not so large a proportion of their salaries for the regular academic year as the work done in the summer is of that done in the regular year, the per capita cost of summer instruction is claimed to be less than that of instruction during the usual nine- or ten-months session. Furthermore, if pupils attend during the summer as well as the regular year and thus complete their school work sooner, the total number in school at any given time will be smaller than if they do not attend during the summer and, therefore, the total building accommodations, equipment, and so forth, needed will be less. If they attend only three of four quarters, and these three differ for different children, a smaller number will be in attendance at any one time and thus fewer accommodations will be needed. If, instead of either of the above conditions holding, pupils remain in school to the same ages as at present and thus reach higher levels, the educational output of the schools will be greater than at present, but will require only the same building accommodations and equipment, since no more pupils will be present at any one time.

Another of the most frequently urged arguments for summer work is that, especially in large cities, the environment of the school is much better than that in which children would be if they were not in

¹The favorable arguments given here, also the unfavorable ones which follow, represent a summary of those advanced by numerous advocates or opponents of summer work. Therefore references for each are not given here, but instead a selected list is to be found at the end of this chapter.

school. It is claimed that pupils learn many bad habits, such as petty thievery, loafing, gambling, gang life, and so forth, during the long summer vacation, which both render them less desirable citizens and make the problem of the school more difficult. Not only is the school environment said to be better in this respect, but also from the point of view of hygiene. Both the home and the other conditions in which many city and some rural children live are far less satisfactory in this respect than is the typical school. It is pointed out that in the larger part of this country the summer rather than the winter is the season of the year in which the physical conditions at school are most satisfactory and that, therefore, it is unwise to have no school at that time. Since the problem of providing heat is practically absent, pupils can have a great deal more fresh air in their rooms and can also spend more time out-of-doors. Furthermore, it is claimed that disease epidemics can be better controlled and prevented when children are in school under supervision than when they are not there. These arguments also appear to be true, especially in the case of city children not living in the better residence sections. They are recognized by many parents, especially the more intelligent ones, who are too busy to give as much time to their children as they would like, hence worry concerning what the children can do during the summer that will help their physical, mental, and spiritual development. It is pointed out that especially in the case of city children there are comparatively few wholesome summer activities, and that those which are desirable can easily be carried on outside of school hours if the school itself does not provide them. In the case of the much larger number of parents who do not worry very much concerning their children's summer occupations, the situation is even worse, since almost no effort is made to provide such children with the right kinds of activities.

A third argument advanced has to do with what may be called instructional or educational, as contrasted with financial, economy. It is commonly recognized by teachers and others concerned that when pupils return to school in September, several weeks' work is usually necessary to bring them up to the level of achievement at which they had arrived when school closed the preceding May or June. Attendance at summer school avoids such a loss. Furthermore, and perhaps more important, pupils who have failed during the regular year can in many cases make up the work in which they have failed during the summer and thus can progress at what is generally considered the regular rate. Likewise pupils able to do so can shorten the time of completing elementary and high school by carrying advance work

in the summer; thus it becomes probable that many more pupils will complete each given level of the educational system. Also, some proponents of summer work urge that it will enable pupils to enter vocational or professional schools and industry earlier or, if not earlier, to secure a better preparation before they do enter.

It has been claimed by some that the large number of failures in university work is likely due in part to the short period of schooling, and that if the school year were lengthened, failures would be markedly reduced. Those who advance this argument believe that the chief function of summer work should be to enable pupils to complete the public school more thoroughly rather than more rapidly.

Another argument sometimes advanced is that summer work in addition to that during the regular academic year, or, in other words, the all-year school, provides a better preparation for life because it accustoms children to working all but a few weeks of the year, which is what will be expected of them later in most vocations.

It is urged as an advantage of the all-year school, which is ordinarily divided into four quarters of twelve weeks each, that pupils who fail lose only three months' time rather than four and one-half or five months. Furthermore, especially in the elementary school, the organization of work into units three months in length is said to be better suited to pupils' maturity, since it is difficult for them to look ahead longer periods of time or work toward more distant goals. In other words, it is easier to keep their interest and stimulate them to work in connection with a three-months' term than with a four and one-half or five-months' semester.

From the point of view of the teachers an advantage claimed is that by teaching throughout the summer, their earnings can be considerably increased, and yet that they will have as long a vacation as do workers in most other vocations. One writer has suggested that instead of the usual long summer vacation, it is better for them to teach the full year for several years and then take a whole year off, and that the extra remuneration received for summer work will enable them to do this.

Unfavorable arguments. Probably the chief argument advanced against summer work is that it is of an inferior quality compared to that done during the regular year. Closely connected with this is the claim that pupils who attend school the whole year and thus gain time are poorly prepared or too immature when they reach the higher levels of work, the high school, and still more the college and university. It is stated that mere time in school is not sufficient, even

though the quality of the instruction offered is high. There is no doubt that this contention is true in some cases, but it does not appear to be an inevitable, or even very common, outcome of summer work. Many schools enforce as rigid standards in the summer as during the rest of the year and all can do so. No convincing evidence has been adduced to prove the immaturity of summer-school pupils.

One group of arguments appears to be based upon the general assumption that attendance at school is a necessary evil and, therefore, should be reduced to a minimum. It is claimed that school provides an artificial, unnatural, and unhygienic environment, that children are made too dependent thereby, that they are controlled too much by the state and its representatives rather than by their parents, that they are thrown into groups too much and thus do not develop individually as they should, and so on. Therefore it is urged that the longer the summer vacation the better, provided, of course, that the term be of sufficient length to insure the acquisition of desirable facts, abilities, and attitudes. Few people who know our schools intimately will agree that they produce the results pictured to such a degree as to warrant the conclusion drawn. If they do, however, they should be reformed, not regarded as a necessary evil.

Some advance the contention that children must learn so many things from sources outside the school, especially, of course, from the family, that attendance at school during practically the whole year limits opportunity for such learning entirely too much. Some of those who urge this admit that in the case of parents who cannot or will not do their part, it is perhaps better that children should attend in the summer as well as during the regular year, but they argue that even here attention should be centered on getting the parents to do their duty or providing other agencies to do it rather than putting the children in school. This argument seems scarcely valid if one considers the small fraction of their total time which children spend in school. If they attend six hours a day, which is longer than most do attend, five days a week, for forty-eight weeks a year, the total time spent in school is less than one-sixth of that in the year. Even counting out the time spent in sleep, they have fully two and one-half times as much time out of school as in school. Surely this is sufficient for the purposes named above.

Some who argue that it is highly desirable that children be kept off the streets, away from certain types of recreation, and even out of certain kinds of homes, do not admit that the school is the desirable agency to accomplish this. Instead they urge the use of playgrounds

and other means similar rather to the early vacation schools than to the common present-day type of summer school which offers more or less the same course of study as is given during the regular year. It appears, however, that the public school is the most efficient agency for this purpose. Furthermore, it combines most of the advantages of the playground with additional ones not gained therefrom.

From the practical standpoint it is claimed that the four-quarter all-year school is undesirable in that it involves four periods of reorganization as contrasted with only two or three in the ordinary plan. Not only do these periods entail a considerable amount of extra work on the part of teachers and other school officials, but they also constitute breaks into the continuity of the work and loss of time on the part of the pupils. The answer is that school exists for the sake of the pupils and that whatever administrative details are necessary in connection with the most efficient educational activity should be carried out. The additional labor of this sort entailed by summer work is really not very great, however. By proper planning the effect of the breaks referred to can be made almost, if not quite, negligible.

Evidence as to the outcomes of summer work. Comparatively few objective or scientific studies dealing with the advantages and disadvantages of summer-school work have been published and presumably, therefore, few have been made. The results from studies of this sort with which the writer is familiar, and also of some others of a much less objective and scientific nature, will be summarized in the following pages. Some of the reported evidence is no more than mere expression of opinion, but because it is, in some cases at least, the expression of the opinions of those who were in such positions or had made such observations that their opinions should carry some weight, it will be given.

*The Newark Survey.*² The outstanding study of summer public-school work is that made in Newark, New Jersey. As has been previously mentioned, this city established regular summer sessions in 1885 and in 1912 introduced the first of its all-year schools, which later came to include the elementary, junior high-school and senior high-

²Farrand, Wilson and O'Shea, M. V. "All-Year Schools in Newark," *School and Society*, 23:462-69, April 10, 1926.

Farrand, Wilson and O'Shea, M. V. "The All-Year Schools of Newark, New Jersey." Newark, New Jersey: Board of Education, 1925. 96 p.

Lovell, L. E. "All-Year School," *Educational Review*, 73:196-202, April, 1927.

"The All-Year School," *Elementary School Journal*, 26:401-5, February, 1926.

"The All-Year School," *Elementary School Journal*, 24:409-11, February, 1924.

"The All-Year School," *Michigan Education Journal*, 6:111-12, October, 1928.

"The All-Year School in Newark," *Elementary School Journal*, 26:561-63, April, 1926.

"The All-Year School Situation in Newark, New Jersey," *School and Society*, 22:715-16, December 5, 1925.

"The All-Year School Wins," *American School Board Journal*, 73:66, December, 1926.

school levels. Dr. Poland, who was superintendent when the all-year schools were introduced, had the plan criticized by experts and tested in what was at the time considered a careful manner, and on the basis of the results obtained approved it. These results indicated among other things that the health of the pupils and of the teachers was not injured, that pupils liked summer work, and that summer heat was not an obstacle.

When Superintendent Corson took office a few years later, he approved the idea, but in a comparatively short time changed his opinion and recommended that such schools be abolished. Because of the strong protests made against his recommendation by principals, teachers, pupils, and parents, Dr. Wilson Farrand of Newark Academy and Professor M. V. O'Shea of Wisconsin were invited to conduct an investigation to determine the efficiency of all-year schools as compared with those of the so-called "traditional" type. These men consented to do so, and secured the cooperation of Professor W. Carson Ryan, Jr., of Swarthmore, Professor W. A. McCall of Teachers College, Dr. A. T. Wylie of Columbia, Dr. R. K. Atkinson of Russell Sage Foundation, and others.

The results of this survey, which were published in a report of almost one hundred pages, are decidedly favorable to the all-year school. The investigators found that Superintendent Carson's three bases of condemning it were not valid. The first was that such schools do not coordinate well with other schools. This was admitted, but since the all-year schools were found to be superior to the other schools, it was recommended that all schools be put on this basis and thus the lack of coordination avoided. His second argument was that the advantages gained by a comparatively few pupils cost too much. The study showed, however, that the cost per unit of work in the all-year schools was appreciably less than in the others. In the third place, Superintendent Corson had claimed that the all-year pupils who were graduated from elementary schools were not so well equipped for high-school work as were the others. In response to this it was shown that most of the pupils in the all-year schools came from the foreign sections of the city and on the whole possessed below average ability and, therefore, might be expected to do poorer work in high school regardless of what type of elementary school they attended.

In addition to presenting refutations of Superintendent Corson's objections, the surveyors studied other phases of the question. It was shown by physical examinations that the condition of all-year pupils in September was as good as that of pupils who had attended during

the regular academic year and spent the summer at the seashore. The teachers were not subjected to physical examinations, but of eighty-seven who answered a questionnaire, eighty-two stated that they had not suffered from teaching in the summer with regard to their health, energy, and general spirits. Although data were not given to prove the point, the investigators stated their belief that the all-year schools were responsible for a large proportion of pupils advancing further in their school work than would otherwise have been the case. In other words, their chief value consists in holding pupils in school and in reducing retardation and elimination rather than enabling large numbers of pupils to gain time. They indicate also their belief that from other than strictly educational points of view attendance in summer school is desirable.

In addition to the findings of this survey, other data regarding the all-year schools of Newark have been gathered and published. Without detail, it may be stated briefly that these support some of the conclusions of the surveyors, especially those having to do with the reduction in per capita cost and the increase of graduation from both elementary and high school, and do not conflict with any.

*Nashville.*³ No special survey of summer work appears to have been made in Nashville, but various data concerning it have been published. Enrollment was voluntary, but was about two-thirds as great as in the winter. The daily attendance during the summer was about 94 per cent of the enrollment, and the tardiness only .22 per cent. The promotion rate was 85 per cent as compared with 79 per cent in the winter. Although the pupils who attended during the summer were not required to attend the following fall term, the attendance that term was larger than during any term of the previous year. In other words, attendance during the summer apparently had no effect in reducing that immediately thereafter. All of the regular teachers who wished to do so, about six-sevenths of all, were allowed to teach in the summer. The superintendent's conclusion both after the first year and later was that the new plan was a success chiefly because of the increased adaptation to individual needs which it made possible.

*Deffenbaugh's study.*⁴ In one of the earlier studies of summer sessions, Deffenbaugh collected the opinions of superintendents and other

³Weber, H. C. "All-Year Public School Succeeding," *Texas Outlook*, 9:7-8, June, 1925.

Weber, H. C. "Defense Through the Educated Quota: The All-Year School," *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, Washington: National Education Association, 1925, p. 751-59.

Weber, H. C. "To Increase the Educated Quota—The All-Year School," *Journal of Education*, 102:102-7, August 13, 1925.

"The All-Year School," *Michigan Education Journal*, 6:111-12, October, 1928.

⁴Deffenbaugh, W. S. "Summer Sessions of City Schools," *U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin*, 1917, No. 45. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918. 45 p.

administrative officials in charge of more than one hundred summer high schools and two hundred summer elementary schools. One of the items of information obtained had to do with the effect of such sessions on the health of pupils. Practically all those who replied stated that the effect was to improve the health of those who attended.

*Bush's findings.*⁵ Bush's two studies report a number of conclusions, practically all of which are based upon opinion. His nationwide study of summer high schools in medium sized cities yielded opinions of administrators in the majority of more than two to one that the results obtained in the summer were as good as in the regular year. In his other study he quotes a few opinions and gives conclusions that tend in the same direction.

*Jones' results.*⁶ Almost none of the facts gathered by Jones offer evidence as to the efficiency of summer work. Apart from the general increase in the amount of such work reported, the one significant fact is that practically 15 per cent of summer pupils failed as compared with 10 per cent in the last semester of the previous year.

*Hoffman's study.*⁷ Hoffman likewise reported almost no data bearing on the efficiency of such schools. He did, however, give figures for promotions, showing that in the cities that reported them the per cents ranged from 45 to 96, the median being about 78. Unfortunately he gave no corresponding data for the regular year.

*Reals' study.*⁸ Reals, as a part of his study, attempted to determine certain facts that bear upon the question at issue. He found that of summer pupils in New York City high schools, from 60 to 79 per cent wrote Regents Examination papers that were accepted as passing, an average which he considers good in view of the short length of the summer term. He also gave achievement tests in five high-school subjects, accompanied by intelligence tests, to about fifteen hundred summer high-school pupils. The results indicate that on the whole the summer-school pupils were decidedly lower in intelligence than those of the regular year. Despite this fact, however, the achievement test results were slightly better for the summer-school pupils than for the others. Out of twenty-nine possible comparisons seventeen favored

⁵Bush, R. H. "Current Practices in Summer School," *School Review*, 32:142-46, February, 1924.

Bush, R. H. "The Status of the Summer Schools in the Secondary Schools of Illinois." Springfield, Illinois: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1926. 69 p.

⁶Jones, J. W. "High School Summer Work in Indiana," *School of Education Bulletin*, Indiana University, Vol. 2, No. 2. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1925, p. 43-47.

⁷Hoffman, M. D. "Status of Summer High Schools in Cities of More than 100,000 Population," *School Review*, 33:107-14, February, 1925.

⁸Reals, W. H. "A Study of the Summer High School," *Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education*, No. 337. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928. 88 p.

the summer pupils, three those of the regular year, and nine were not significant. Furthermore, he followed up about four hundred summer-school pupils into their work of the next year and compared their ability to do such work with that of others. Out of thirteen comparisons five favored the regular-year pupils and eight yielded no significant differences. In another study of about four hundred pupils, he found that 57 per cent of them considered their summer work more valuable than that of the regular year, that 26 per cent thought it was less valuable, and 17 per cent rated it the same. In this group 22 per cent failed in enough work to be definitely retarded. He gives as reasons why summer work is superior that it is more intensive because pupils are not allowed to carry more than two subjects, and because the periods are usually longer, that it is more adapted to the individual pupil, that it is more purposeful since attendance is voluntary rather than compulsory, and that there are no extra-curricular activities to interfere with it.

*Garfield High School, Terre Haute.*⁹ Clogston reports a study of the health and scholarship of pupils attending the nine-weeks' summer session of the Garfield High School in Terre Haute, Indiana. Pupils were weighed at the beginning and end of the session, teachers filled out blanks each week as to the pupils' condition, and the pupils themselves filled out questionnaires concerning absences due to illness during the preceding semester and the summer. It was found that the majority of pupils gained slightly in weight or remained the same, although the average loss was one ounce, largely because of one pupil who lost a considerable amount. The teachers lost an average of about one and one-half pounds during the summer. Apparently there was less absence due to illness during the summer than during the previous year. The per cent of attendance during the summer was 95.5 as compared with 96.4 for the previous semester. About 53 per cent of the pupils' summer marks were higher than those they had made the second semester of the preceding year, about 32 per cent were lower, and about 14 per cent the same. In all of the subjects offered in the summer except two, the per cents of failures were less.

Summary. The chief arguments in favor of summer work are that it is both financially and educationally economical and that it provides much better environment for children than that to which they would otherwise be exposed. The chief arguments against it, none of which appear to be entirely valid, are that the work done in summer

⁹Clogston, E. B. "Health and Scholarship in Summer High School," *School Review*, 37:760-63, December, 1929.

is inferior, that the school environment is not satisfactory, that children's time outside of school should not be reduced, and that extra administrative work is caused. The thorough survey made in Newark resulted in findings very favorable to summer work and the all-year school. Less scientific and careful studies in Nashville and a few other cities yielded similar results. These are supported by the opinions of administrative officials and others who have been in positions enabling them to observe summer work and the results thereof. On the whole, therefore, the evidence in favor of summer work may be considered rather strong.

REFERENCES CONTAINING ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST SUMMER WORK

- BUSH, R. H. "Current Practices in Summer School," *School Review*, 32:142-46, February, 1924.
- BUSH, R. H. "The Status of the Summer Schools in the Secondary Schools of Illinois." Springfield, Illinois: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1926. 69 p.
- CLOGSTON, E. B. "Health and Scholarship in Summer High School," *School Review*, 37:760-63, December, 1929.
- DEFFENBAUGH, W. S. "Summer Sessions of City Schools," *U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin*, 1917, No. 45. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918. 45 p.
- FARRAND, WILSON and O'SHEA, M. V. "All-Year Schools in Newark," *School and Society*, 23:462-69, April 10, 1926.
- FARRAND, WILSON and O'SHEA, M. V. "The All-Year Schools of Newark, New Jersey." Newark, New Jersey: Board of Education, 1925. 96 p.
- HOFFMAN, M. D. "Status of Summer High Schools in Cities of More than 100,000 Population," *School Review*, 33:107-14, February, 1925.
- JONES, J. W. "High School Summer Work in Indiana," *School of Education Bulletin*, *Indiana University*, Vol. 2, No. 2. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1925, p. 43-47.
- LOVELL, L. E. "All-Year School," *Educational Review*, 73:196-202, April, 1927.
- REALS, W. H. "A Study of the Summer High School," *Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education*, No. 337. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928. 88 p.
- WEBER, H. C. "All-Year Public School Succeeding," *Texas Outlook*, 9:7-8, June, 1925.
- WEBER, H. C. "Defense Through the Educated Quota: The All-Year School," *Proceedings of the National Education Association*. Washington: National Education Association, 1925, p. 751-59.
- WEBER, H. C. "To Increase the Educated Quota—The All-Year School," *Journal of Education*, 102:102-7, August 13, 1925.
- "The All-Year School," *Elementary School Journal*, 24:409-11, February, 1924.
- "The All-Year School," *Elementary School Journal*, 26:401-5, February, 1926.
- "The All-Year School in Newark," *Elementary School Journal*, 26:561-63, April, 1926.
- "The All-Year School," *Michigan Education Journal*, 6:111-12, October, 1928.
- "The All-Year School Situation in Newark, New Jersey," *School and Society*, 22:715-16, December 5, 1925.
- "The All-Year School Wins," *American School Board Journal*, 73:66, December, 1926.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Development and present status. A century or so ago it was common for city schools to continue in session throughout most of the summer, and for rural schools to be held then rather than in the most severe part of winter. This practice gradually disappeared, leaving instead a long summer vacation. There has, however, been a strong tendency to return to the practice of having summer elementary and high schools. This began with vacation schools, of which the first started in Boston in 1866, then included regular summer schools, which began in Newark in 1885, and finally a few all-year schools dating from that of Bluffton in 1905. Surveys, made by Deffenbaugh, Bush, and others, show that the number of systems offering such work and of pupils taking it has increased rapidly until at present almost all of our larger city systems and many of those in smaller cities, towns, and even villages, are giving some work of this type, and that the attendance has reached at least three-fourths of a million pupils each summer.

Among the characteristic features most frequently found in some of the surveys just referred to and also in one of summer work in 1929 in the public schools of Illinois made by the writer are the following: The term is usually either six or eight weeks in length, and the daily sessions not far from four hours each. High-school pupils are ordinarily limited to two subjects and elementary pupils to one semester's work. Pupils who have failed, or perhaps who are in danger of failing, are allowed to attend, and also frequently those who wish to gain time. Almost all summer teachers also teach during the regular year. The work is about equally often organized in regular classes and on an individual basis and credit is almost always given for it. In a majority of the larger systems no charge is made, but in smaller ones the situation is reversed.

Evaluation of summer work. There has been considerable argument concerning the outcomes of summer work in the public schools, as to whether they are desirable or undesirable, but little objective or conclusive evidence concerning them has been published. On the basis of a critical consideration of the arguments advanced and of what evidence there is available, several conclusions seem justified. The per capita cost of summer school or of the all-year school is less

than that of the ordinary school year of eight, nine, or ten months. Attendance during the summer benefits pupils educationally by allowing some to make up failures, by helping others so that they are prevented from failing, and by permitting others who are able to do so to gain time. It also helps pupils physically and morally, since the school environment is better in both these respects than that in which most children would be if they were out of school. On the whole, the quality of summer work is probably as high as that of work done during the regular school year. The rapid spread of the movement appears to leave little doubt that it will soon become a feature of most school systems, and there appear to be no compelling reasons why any system should refuse to adopt it.

Because of these and other minor considerations, the writer does not see how it is possible to avoid the conclusion that summer work on the elementary and high-school levels has passed the experimental stage and shown its worth. Boards of education, administrative officers, and others responsible for determining school policies in systems where such work is not already offered should give serious consideration to the question of introducing it. Furthermore, there appear to be certain advantages possessed by the all-year school organized in four terms of twelve weeks each over the regular two-semester year plus a short summer term. For the present, at least, it is probably unwise in most communities to extend compulsory education to include attendance during the summer as well as during the remainder of the year, but the summer term should be open to all who wish to take advantage of it, and all pupils should be encouraged to do so. Furthermore, there should be no tuition charge, but attendance should be free just as during the regular year. If it seems impossible to finance summer work on this basis, it is better to begin by offering such work with a tuition charge and to plan toward doing away with this charge as soon as possible rather than not to offer it at all.

